OBSERVATION REPORT # 29

KPMG Consulting submitted different instances of the same Local Service Request Order and received inconsistent flow-through results.

Issue

During NJ volume testing, KPMG Consulting received inconsistent responses when submitting orders to add a second line to a CLEC resale 1-line residential customer. All the instances submitted to Verizon via EDI failed to flow through while some of the instances submitted via the Verizon Web Graphical User Interface (GUI) flowed through. Other instances submitted via the Web GUI did not flow through. All of the orders were submitted in training mode and were identical, except for the PON field and the submission date and time.

The following table lists sample PONs which can be used to illustrate the issue:

Date	EDI NFT[1] PON	Web GUI FT[2] PON	Web GUI NFT PON
10-Oct	0130112N1X004170	0130112F1X004207	None on 10/10
12-Oct	0130113N1X003608	0130113F1X003794	0130113F1X003796
17-Oct	0130111N1X005192	0130111F1X005208	0130111F1X005207
20-Oct	0130114N1X000046	0130114F1X001000	0130114F1X001002

Assessment

Inconsistent flow through processing may impede a CLEC's ability to anticipate the confirmation of service orders.

---

[1] NFT indicates an order that failed to flow through.
[2] FT indicates an order that successfully flowed through.